

2015-2016 Annual Assessment Report Template

For instructions and guidelines visit our [website](#)
or [contact us](#) for more help.

Report:

Question 1: Program Learning Outcomes

Q1.1.

Which of the following Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals (BLGs) **did you assess?** [Check all that apply]

- ☐ 1. Critical Thinking
- ☐ 2. Information Literacy
- ☐ 3. Written Communication
- ☐ 4. Oral Communication
- ☐ 5. Quantitative Literacy
- ☐ 6. Inquiry and Analysis
- ☐ 7. Creative Thinking
- ☐ 8. Reading
- ☐ 9. Team Work
- ☐ 10. Problem Solving
- ☐ 11. Civic Knowledge and Engagement
- ☐ 12. Intercultural Knowledge and Competency
- ☐ 13. Ethical Reasoning
- ☐ 14. Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning
- ☐ 15. Global Learning
- ☐ 16. Integrative and Applied Learning
- ☐ 17. Overall Competencies for GE Knowledge
- ☒ 18. Overall Competencies in the Major/Discipline
- ☐ 19. Other, specify any assessed PLOs not included above:

- a.
- b.
- c.

Q1.2.

Please provide more detailed background information about **EACH PLO** you checked above and other information such as how your specific PLOs are **explicitly** linked to the Sac State BLGs:

Program Learning Outcomes

Program Learning Outcomes and Links to Campus Baccalaureate Learning Goals

The PLO's link to the BLGs are articulated in the Studio Art Assessment Plan (summarized below) which addresses both the University's goals and NASAD's requirements.

Overall Competencies in the discipline:

There are two levels of coursework, lower and upper division. The two levels of coursework establish both a breadth of knowledge/skill in the discipline overall, and a focused skill level in a single artistic medium.

The lower division core in Studio Art establishes a foundation for the upper division courses. The upper division focus towards skill in a single artistic medium is developed through upper division coursework, and fully realized through the 192A Senior Seminar. The Senior Seminar is the culminating Studio Art class, where students continue to develop their studio practice and their critical discourse. The senior seminar concludes with a culminating project in the Seminar and the Senior Show, an exhibition of students' work. Art 199 is also utilized by some faculty as a Senior Project, extending the Senior Seminar experience over two semesters.

Knowledge of human cultures: This goal is an integral component of the Art History courses required in the Studio Art concentration (15 units in 60 unit BA, and 9 units in the 48 unit program). Artistic media from different eras and cultures are introduced in several Studio Art classes, so cultural issues are also addressed in relation to students' own artmaking. In the Senior Seminar (the culminating studio art class) students draw on influences from human cultures and art practices that influence them in the creation of their culminating work.

Intellectual and practical skills: Oral and written communication skills are addressed in multiple courses in the Studio Art concentrations. "Visual literacy" is given particular emphasis. Practical skills, including information literacy, also are addressed in several courses. All Studio Art courses involve the development of skill in artistic media; all courses include critique sessions where students develop their verbal skills (ability to articulate aesthetic ideas). Students develop significant professional skills in the senior seminar (ART 192A). They may also use courses like Gallery Management (ART 193) and the Artist and the Marketplace (ART 128) as an upper division elective. They also can earn units for an internship (ART 195).

Personal and social responsibility: "Intercultural knowledge," including sensitivity to cultural differences and their expression in the visual arts, is addressed in many courses in the Art major.

Integrative learning: The Senior Seminar plays an important role here, as it brings together students with specializations in different artistic media and reinforces connections between the courses taken to fulfill degree requirements in previous semesters.

Four over-arching PLOs were defined by the Art Studio area, regardless of the artistic medium involved (all four correspond to goals set forth by NASAD for this discipline). All of these PLOs are assessed in the Senior Seminar, and in Senior Projects, where overall Competencies in the Discipline are measured.

1. Students will articulate the content of their work and become confident in discussing it with others.
2. Students will independently frame aesthetic problems to solve.
3. Students will evidence self-motivation in the research, production, and exhibition of their work.
4. Students will develop skills appropriate for the manipulation of mediums.

Q1.2.1.

Do you have rubrics for your PLOs?

- ☐ 1. Yes, for all PLOs
- ☒ 2. Yes, but for some PLOs
- ☐ 3. No rubrics for PLOs
- ☐ 4. N/A
- ☐ 5. Other, specify:

Q1.3.

Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university?

- ☒ 1. Yes

- ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know

Q1.4.

Is your program externally accredited (other than through WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC))?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No (skip to **Q1.5**)
- ☐ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q1.5**)

Q1.4.1.

If the answer to Q1.4 is **yes**, are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission/goals/outcomes of the accreditation agency?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know

Q1.5.

Did your program use the *Degree Qualification Profile* (DQP) to develop your PLO(s)?

- ☐ 1. Yes
- ☒ 2. No, but I know what the DQP is
- ☐ 3. No, I don't know what the DQP is
- ☐ 4. Don't know

Q1.6.

Did you use action verbs to make each PLO measurable?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know

(**Remember:** Save your progress)

Question 2: Standard of Performance for the Selected PLO

Q2.1.

Select **ONE(1)** PLO here as an example to illustrate how you conducted assessment (be sure you *checked the correct box* for this PLO in Q1.1):

Overall Competencies in the Major/Discipline

Q2.1.1.

Please provide more background information about the **specific PLO** you've chosen in Q2.1.

The Senior Seminar is the primary method of assessing Overall Competencies in the Major/Discipline:

Senior Seminar / Senior Project Outcomes:

In the Senior Seminar and Senior Projects, student outcomes are artworks: drawings, paintings, sculptures, installations, ceramic objects, small metals / jewelry, videos, animations, digital images, experimental games, as well as accompanying written work. Artworks created in the Senior Seminar are assessed using the Art Department's grading rubric.

Senior Seminar Final Critique / Senior Project Presentation:

This is a three-day event when each student in the course presents a body of work that is evidence of the PLO. The students are required to present work and to respond critically to their own work and that of their peers.

Senior Seminar Final Critique / Senior Project Portfolio:

In this capstone course, students create a digital portfolio in the form of a PowerPoint or other digital method that chronicles their progression and the PLOs in the BA Seminar.

Senior Seminar / Senior Project Presentation:

As a conclusion to the Senior Seminar, students present a Senior Show in the Witt and Else galleries. This show is curated, organized, installed, promoted and supervised by students, with faculty supervision. Faculty teaching the Senior Seminar use it as a formal assessment tool for students in Senior Seminar. In addition, all faculty visit the exhibition, and it is used to assess the overall competency of graduating students.

Senior Seminar / Senior Project and the Digital Archive:

The work produced by students in the Senior Seminar is uploaded to the digital archive. Studio Art faculty meet to review the digital archive and discuss insights gained from the assembled material.

Senior Seminar / Senior Project Informal Assessment:

Faculty teaching the Senior Seminar can ascertain which skills are weak or lacking in our students. That information, shared with other faculty, has helped us make informed decisions about what improvements might be needed in the structure or content of specific courses taken prior to the senior year. Studio Art faculty meet regularly to discuss curriculum development.

In addition, the following assessment strategies are used to assess Overall Competencies in the Major/Discipline::

Exhibitions:

An ongoing schedule of faculty and student-organized shows in the Art Department's galleries and studios allow faculty to review student progress and the consistency of course outcomes. Statements written by outside jurors for the juried Award Show provide useful insights about our program, as reflected in the quality of the art submitted by the students. Studio Art faculty also visit, and discuss the student-designed shows in the Witt and Else Galleries. Insights gained from these sources have helped inform Art faculty decisions about the design of courses and curriculum.

Digital Archive:

Each semester, on a rotational basis, coursework is collected from selected courses within the department. The online Assessment Site provides an ongoing resource for assessing the quality of student work across the Studio Art curriculum. Art faculty meet on a regular basis to review the digital archive as a group and discuss insights gained from the assembled material.

Student Evaluations:

All faculty must have all courses evaluated by their students every semester. The same Art Department questionnaire is used in each case (one for each teaching area—Art Education, Art History, or Studio Art). The Course Evaluation Form was rewritten in 2008.

Questions on the Course Evaluation form relate back to PLOs 1,2, and 3:

2. *Coursework is focused on exploring/learning about the medium (drawing, painting, printmaking, ceramics, sculptures, new media, etc.).* corresponds to PLO 4. Students will develop skills appropriate for the manipulation of mediums.
4. *Studio practice is useful and relevant to understanding the area studied and stimulates interest in the subject* relates to PLO 3. Students will evidence self-motivation in the research, production, and exhibition of their work.
5. *Different strategies and paths are introduced with regards to thinking about art or solving problems in the given medium* corresponds to PLO 2. Students will independently frame aesthetic problems to solve.
7. *Critiques allow for thoughtful response to/analysis of student work* corresponds to PLO 1. Students will articulate the content of their work and become confident in discussing it with others.

Faculty use these evaluations to assess teaching performance and adjust course delivery. Evaluations are analyzed and organized to produce an overall picture of the extent to which educational and artistic goals are being attained in the program.

Critique: In the BA Seminar the students critically analyze, interpret, intuit, and judge their own work and that of their peers at different moments throughout the semester. Critiques on an informal level take place each week peer-to-peer, between the professor and students as a group, and finally, in an ongoing dialogue between the instructor and the individual student. The critique sessions are designed in such a way as to assist the students in developing a critical dialogue that serves them both in their own practice and in their overall developing discourse that embraces and integrates the broader context of making.

Q2.2.

Has the program developed or adopted **explicit** standards of performance for this PLO?

- ☒ 1. Yes
☐ 2. No
☐ 3. Don't know
☐ 4. N/A

Q2.3.

Please **provide the rubric(s)** and **standards of performance** that you have developed for this PLO here or in the appendix.

Attached

Rubrics

1. Art Department standard grading rubric for Art Studio courses (attached)
2. Assessment of Senior Project (199) student blog
3. Student evaluation form

Standards of Performance

1. Senior Show
2. Else and Witt gallery exhibitions
3. External assessment (NASAD review every ten years)

The Art Department undergoes a re-accreditation review by the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD) every ten years. The need for a higher level of conceptual and skills development, recognized at the 2005 review (at which we also were encouraged to consider developing a BFA degree), helped prompt the creation of the 60-unit version of the Studio Art concentration.

4. Formal and Informal Critique

5. Student professional achievements, post graduation: admission into graduate programs, professional achievements, employment (Art Dept Student Achievements.xlsx).



grading rubric for art studio.pdf
89.33 KB



Art Dept Student Achievements.xlsx
17.9 KB

Q2.4. PLO	Q2.5. Stdnd	Q2.6. Rubric	Please indicate where you have published the PLO , the standard of performance, and the rubric that was used to measure the PLO:
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1. In SOME course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2. In ALL course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3. In the student handbook/advising handbook
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	4. In the university catalogue
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	5. On the academic unit website or in newsletters
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6. In the assessment or program review reports, plans, resources, or activities
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	7. In new course proposal forms in the department/college/university
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8. In the department/college/university's strategic plans and other planning documents
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	9. In the department/college/university's budget plans and other resource allocation documents
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	10. Other, specify: <input type="text"/>

Question 3: Data Collection Methods and Evaluation of Data Quality for the Selected PLO

Q3.1.

Was assessment data/evidence **collected** for the selected PLO?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No (skip to **Q6**)
- ☐ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q6**)
- ☐ 4. N/A (skip to **Q6**)

Q3.1.1.

How many assessment tools/methods/measures **in total** did you use to assess this PLO?

Q3.2.

Was the data **scored/evaluated** for this PLO?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No (skip to **Q6**)
- ☐ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q6**)
- ☐ 4. N/A (skip to **Q6**)

Q3.2.1.

Please describe how you collected the assessment data for the selected PLO. For example, in what course(s) or by what means were data collected:

Senior Seminar

- 1.) Students present a body of work completed in the BA Seminar that is exhibited at a formal final critique.
- 2.) The work at this final critique is documented in photos by a member of the assessment committee.
- 3.) Each student creates a digital portfolio that is collected at the end.

Senior Show

The Senior Show is an exhibition that all students in the Senior Seminar participate in. Work created by senior students in the Senior Seminar is presented. Faculty, arts professionals and community members are invited to the reception. Feedback from community members provides a valuable measurement of the qualities of outcomes

199 / Senior Project

The Senior Project is a course students in the New Media Art emphasis take in their final or penultimate semester. Students are required to develop independently driven work, which is critiqued during the class. Work produced is documented by the student on a weekly basis, in the form of a 250-word statement and visual documentation, and is assessed weekly. Inconsistencies in the quality of work produced in the Senior Project informs curriculum decisions in the New Media Art program.

199 / Senior Project Show

Students in New Media Art present an exhibition in the Witt Gallery for the Senior Project in the New Media Art emphasis. Faculty, arts professionals and community members are invited to the reception. The quality of work produced, and the standard of presentation are used to assess overall competencies in the New Media Art area. Observations from faculty and community members provide a valuable measurement of the qualities of outcomes.

Exhibitions in the Witt Gallery

Students apply to exhibit their work in solo or group shows in the Witt Gallery. The submissions are juried by the Department's gallery committee. The student-designed shows provide evidence of student competencies in the discipline.

Award Show

The Annual Award Show is a juried show, juried by invited regional arts professionals. Statements written by outside jurors for the Award Show provide useful insights about our program, reflected in the quality of the art submitted by the students, and accepted or rejected by the jurors. Faculty, arts professionals and community members are invited to the reception. Observations from faculty and community members provide a valuable measurement of the qualities of outcomes.

Digital Archive

The online Assessment Site provides an ongoing resource for assessing the quality of student work across the Studio Art curriculum. Each semester, on a rotational basis, coursework is collected from selected courses within the department. This includes upper division required and elective courses, and work created for the Senior Seminar Capstone Project

Tracking student progress, post degree:

Data is collected on: Students accepted into graduate programs, employment and professional awards, grants, exhibitions.

(Remember: Save your progress)

Question 3A: Direct Measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, etc.)

Q3.3.

Were direct measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.) used to assess this PLO?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No (skip to **Q3.7**)
- ☐ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q3.7**)

Q3.3.1.

Which of the following direct measures were used? **[Check all that apply]**

- ☒ 1. Capstone project (e.g. theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences
- ☒ 2. Key assignments from required classes in the program
- ☒ 3. Key assignments from elective classes
- ☒ 4. Classroom based performance assessment such as simulations, comprehensive exams, or critiques
- ☐ 5. External performance assessments such as internships or other community-based projects

- ☐ 6. E-Portfolios
- ☒ 7. Other Portfolios
- ☒ 8. Other, specify:

Q3.3.2.

Please **explain** and **attach** the direct measure you used to collect data:

Direct measures used:

1. The capstone project - work created in the Senior Seminar - is used to assess the PLO and is uploaded to the digital archive for documentation.

Artwork from the capstone project is shown in the Senior Show.

Artwork from the 199 / Senior Project in New Media is uploaded to the digital archive for documentation.

2 & 3. Coursework created in key assignments from selected courses (both required and elective classes) are captured three times per semester and uploaded to the digital archive

4. Oral critiques of coursework are an integral part of most studio art courses. They are assessed using the Standard grading Rubric for Studio Art Courses:

Regarding Participation: student demonstrates through discussion, critique, and studio interaction an ability to discuss and assess work, communicating how visual elements and strategies are used. The student demonstrates use and understanding of concepts and terminology used in the discipline.

8. Student exhibitions are used to formally and informally assess student progress in the degree. (Link to Witt and Else exhibition schedule)



192A_Syllabus_Harvey.pdf
107.9 KB



192A_Class_Schedule_Harvey.pdf
53.46 KB

Q3.4.

What tool was used to evaluate the data?

- ☒ 1. **No** rubric is used to interpret the evidence (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)
- ☐ 2. Used rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
- ☐ 3. Used rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
- ☐ 4. Used rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
- ☐ 5. The VALUE rubric(s) (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
- ☐ 6. Modified VALUE rubric(s) (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
- ☐ 7. Used other means (Answer **Q3.4.1.**)

Q3.4.1.

If you used other means, which of the following measures was used? [**Check all that apply**]

- ☐ 1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)
- ☐ 2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g. CLA, ETS PP, etc.) (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)
- ☐ 3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g. ETC, GRE, etc.) (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)
- ☒ 4. Other, specify: (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)

Q3.4.2.

Was the **rubric** aligned directly and explicitly **with the PLO**?

- ☐ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know

☒ 4. N/A

Q3.4.3.

Was the **direct measure** (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly **with the rubric**?

- ☐ 1. Yes
☐ 2. No
☐ 3. Don't know
☒ 4. N/A

Q3.4.4.

Was the **direct measure** (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly **with the PLO**?

- ☐ 1. Yes
☐ 2. No
☐ 3. Don't know
☒ 4. N/A

Q3.5.

How many faculty members participated in planning the assessment data **collection** of the selected PLO?

All Studio Art faculty, with input
from part-time faculty

Q3.5.1.

How many faculty members participated in the **evaluation** of the assessment data for the selected PLO?

All full-time Studio Art faculty

Q3.5.2.

If the data was evaluated by multiple scorers, was there a norming process (a procedure to make sure everyone was scoring similarly)?

- ☐ 1. Yes
☐ 2. No
☐ 3. Don't know
☒ 4. N/A

Q3.6.

How did you **select** the sample of student work (papers, projects, portfolios, etc.)?

Assessment Database

Sample work is selected from different courses on a rotational basis.

Faculty selected represented samples of student work that best reflected the coursework undertaken.

Q3.6.1.

How did you **decide** how many samples of student work to review?

For standardization, five samples were taken three times per semester from each selected course

Q3.6.2.

How many students were in the class or program?

Variable. Studio courses are on average between 20 - 25 students.
Approximately 24 students in

Q3.6.3.

How many samples of student work did you evaluated?

five samples are taken three times per semester from each selected course. All lower division, upper division and Se

Q3.6.4.

Was the sample size of student work for the direct measure adequate?

- ☒ 1. Yes
☐ 2. No
☐ 3. Don't know

(**Remember:** Save your progress)

Question 3B: Indirect Measures (surveys, focus groups, interviews, etc.)

Q3.7.

Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO?

- ☐ 1. Yes
☒ 2. No (skip to **Q3.8**)
☐ 3. Don't Know (skip to **Q3.8**)

Q3.7.1.

Which of the following indirect measures were used? [**Check all that apply**]

- ☐ 1. National student surveys (e.g. NSSE)
☐ 2. University conducted student surveys (e.g. OIR)
☒ 3. College/department/program student surveys or focus groups
☐ 4. Alumni surveys, focus groups, or interviews
☐ 5. Employer surveys, focus groups, or interviews
☐ 6. Advisory board surveys, focus groups, or interviews
☐ 7. Other, specify:

Q3.7.1.1.

Please explain and attach the indirect measure you used to collect data:

Every course is evaluated by a single evaluative tool comprised of questions that relate directly to the PLO.



Pages from ART.Studio-PrintableForms-Fall2015 (duplex).pdf
134.11 KB



No file attached

Q3.7.2.

If surveys were used, how was the sample size **decided**?

All students in each course

Q3.7.3.

If surveys were used, how did you **select** your sample:

Every course is surveyed.

Q3.7.4.

If surveys were used, what was the response rate?

Approximately 20-100% return rate

Question 3C: Other Measures (external benchmarking, licensing exams, standardized tests, etc.)

Q3.8.

Were external benchmarking data, such as licensing exams or standardized tests, used to assess the PLO?

- ☐ 1. Yes
- ☒ 2. No (skip to **Q3.8.2**)
- ☐ 3. Don't Know (skip to **Q3.8.2**)

Q3.8.1.Which of the following measures was used? [**Check all that apply**]

- ☐ 1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams
- ☐ 2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g. CLA, ETS PP, etc.)
- ☐ 3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g. ETC, GRE, etc.)
- ☒ 4. Other, specify:

Q3.8.2.

Were other measures used to assess the PLO?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No (skip to **Q4.1**)
- ☐ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q4.1**)

Q3.8.3.

If other measures were used, please specify:

Faculty observation (faculty visiting student shows)

Faculty discussion and evaluation of outcomes during Studio Faculty meetings

(Remember: Save your progress)

Question 4: Data, Findings, and Conclusions

Q4.1.Please provide simple tables and/or graphs to summarize the assessment data, findings, and conclusions for the selected PLO for **Q2.1**:

Not applicable

Q4.2.

Are students doing well and meeting the program standard? If not, how will the program work to improve student performance of the selected PLO?

Yes, most students are doing well and are successful at the program standard, or have exceeded the standard. However, some student work (about 4%) shows signs of a minimal to low reach in attaining the program standard.

In order to achieve a higher level of success among the low performing students, faculty have discussed implementing incremental grading strategies. This will give students the opportunity to better understand how the work produced is a direct reflection of student engagement.



192A_Class_Schedule_Harvey.pdf
53.46 KB



No file attached

Q4.3.

For the selected PLO, the student performance:

- ☒ 1. **Exceeded** expectation/standard
- ☐ 2. **Met** expectation/standard
- ☐ 3. **Partially** met expectation/standard
- ☐ 4. Did not meet expectation/standard
- ☐ 5. No expectation/standard has been specified
- ☐ 6. Don't know

Question 4A: Alignment and Quality

Q4.4.

Did the data, including the direct measures, from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know

Q4.5.

Were **all** the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures of the PLO?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know

Question 5: Use of Assessment Data (Closing the Loop)

Q5.1.

As a result of the assessment effort and based on prior feedback from OAPA, do you anticipate *making any changes* for your program (e.g. course structure, course content, or modification of PLOs)?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No (skip to **Q5.2**)
- ☐ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q5.2**)

Q5.1.1.

Please describe *what changes* you plan to make in your program as a result of your assessment of this PLO. Include a description of how you plan to assess the impact of these changes.

We plan to meet as a studio faculty to discuss how best to assist the very small number of students (4%) who struggle to meet our minimum requirements. Strategies we will discuss could include information sharing across courses and disciplines to facilitate greater student support. We will assess another faculty's Senior Seminar in AY 16/17.

In some studio courses where online evaluations were being used, we received a low yield of student responses. This is an issue for consistent assessment of the PLO. We will institute mandatory paper evaluations for all evaluations in AY2016/17 in order to capture a higher number of student responses and address this problem. We will report the results of this change in program assessment next year.

Q5.1.2.

Do you have a plan to assess the *impact of the changes* that you anticipate making?

- ☒ 1. Yes
☐ 2. No
☐ 3. Don't know

Q5.2.

How have the assessment data from the last annual assessment been used so far? [**Check all that apply**]

	1. Very Much	2. Quite a Bit	3. Some	4. Not at All	5. N/A
1. Improving specific courses	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Modifying curriculum	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Improving advising and mentoring	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Revising learning outcomes/goals	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Developing/updating assessment plan	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Annual assessment reports	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Program review	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. Prospective student and family information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10. Alumni communication	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11. WSCUC accreditation (regional accreditation)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
12. Program accreditation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
13. External accountability reporting requirement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
15. Strategic planning	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
16. Institutional benchmarking	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
17. Academic policy development or modifications	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
18. Institutional improvement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
19. Resource allocation and budgeting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
20. New faculty hiring	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
21. Professional development for faculty and staff	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
22. Recruitment of new students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

23. Other, specify:

Q5.2.1.

Please provide a detailed example of how you used the assessment data above:

N/A

(**Remember:** Save your progress)

Additional Assessment Activities

Q6.

Many academic units have collected assessment data on aspect of their program *that are not related to the PLOs* (i.e. impacts of an advising center, etc.). **If** your program/academic unit has collected data on program *elements*, please briefly report your results here:

N/A



No file attached



No file attached

Q7.

What PLO(s) do you plan to assess next year? [**Check all that apply**]

- ☐ 1. Critical Thinking
- ☐ 2. Information Literacy
- ☐ 3. Written Communication
- ☐ 4. Oral Communication
- ☐ 5. Quantitative Literacy
- ☐ 6. Inquiry and Analysis
- ☐ 7. Creative Thinking
- ☐ 8. Reading
- ☐ 9. Team Work
- ☐ 10. Problem Solving
- ☐ 11. Civic Knowledge and Engagement
- ☐ 12. Intercultural Knowledge and Competency
- ☐ 13. Ethical Reasoning
- ☐ 14. Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning
- ☐ 15. Global Learning
- ☐ 16. Integrative and Applied Learning

- ☐ 17. Overall Competencies for GE Knowledge
- ☒ 18. Overall Competencies in the Major/Discipline
- ☐ 19. Other, specify any PLOs not included above:

- a.
- b.
- c.

Q8. Please attach any additional files here:



Sample_Assessment_Site_Page.tiff
940.8 KB



No file attached



No file attached



No file attached

Q8.1.

Have you attached any files to this form? If yes, please list every attached file here:

Senior Seminar Syllabus
Senior Seminar Schedule
Art Studio Rubric
Art Dept Student Achievements
Art Studio Evaluation Questions
Art Studio Road (Curriculum) Map
Screenshot of Elvis Assessment Site chronicling a decade of assessment

Program Information (**Required**)

P1.

Program/Concentration Name(s): [by degree]

BA Art Studio

P1.1.

Program/Concentration Name(s): [by department]

Art Studio BA

P2.

Report Author(s):

Rachel Clarke and Sarah Flohr

P2.1.

Department Chair/Program Director:

Catherine Turrill

P2.2.

Assessment Coordinator:

Rachel Clarke and Sarah Flohr

P3.

Department/Division/Program of Academic Unit

Art

P4.

College:

College of Arts & Letters

P5.

Total enrollment for Academic Unit during assessment semester (see Departmental Fact Book):

According to CMS, "Enrollment by Department" for Fall 2015, it states that we had a total of 2004 enrolled

P6.

Program Type:

- ☒ 1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major
☐ 2. Credential
☐ 3. Master's Degree
☐ 4. Doctorate (Ph.D./Ed.D./Ed.S./D.P.T./etc.)
☐ 5. Other, specify:

P7. Number of **undergraduate degree programs** the academic unit has?

4

P7.1. List all the names:

Studio Art
Studio Art Methods
Single Subject Pre-Credential Preparation in Art
Art History

P7.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program?

1

P8. Number of **master's degree programs** the academic unit has?

1

P8.1. List all the names:

Master of Arts in Studio Art (MA)

P8.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master's program?

1

P9. Number of **credential programs** the academic unit has?

1

P9.1. List all the names:

Single Subject Pre-Credential Preparation in Art

P10. Number of **doctorate degree programs** the academic unit has?

0

P10.1. List all the names:

When was your **assessment plan...**

	1. Before 2010-11	2. 2011-12	3. 2012-13	4. 2013-14	5. 2014-15	6. No Plan	7. Don't know
P11. developed?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
P11.1. last updated?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

P11.3.

Please attach your latest **assessment plan**:

 No file attached


P12.

Has your program developed a **curriculum map**?

- ☒ 1. Yes
☐ 2. No
☐ 3. Don't know

P12.1.

Please attach your latest **curriculum map**:

 4 YR Plan Art Studio_2015 rev vs original v in advising ppt_v3.xlsx
72.47 KB

P13.

Has your program indicated in the curriculum map where assessment **of student learning** occurs?

- ☒ 1. Yes
☐ 2. No
☐ 3. Don't know

P14.

Does your program have a capstone class?

- ☒ 1. Yes, indicate:
- ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know

P14.1.

Does your program have **any** capstone project?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know

(**Remember:** Save your progress)